

Decision 06-06-049 June 29, 2006

BEFORE THE PUBLIC UTILITIES COMMISSION OF THE STATE OF CALIFORNIA

Application of Pacific Gas and Electric Company for Authority to Establish Its Authorized Rate of Return on Common Equity for Electric Utility Generation and Distribution Operations and Gas Distribution for Test Year 2006. (U 39 M)

Application 05-05-006
(Filed May 9, 2005)

Application of Southern California Edison Company (U 338-E) for Authorized Capital Structure, Rate of Return on Common Equity, Embedded Cost of Debt and Preferred Stock, and Overall Rate of Return for Utility Operations for 2006.

Application 05-05-011
(Filed May 9, 2005)

Application of San Diego Gas & Electric Company (U 902-M) for Authority to: (i) Increase its Authorized Return on Common Equity, (ii) Adjust its Authorized Capital Structure, (iii) Adjust its Authorized Embedded Costs of Debt and Preferred Stock, (iv) Increase its Overall Rate of Return, and (v) Revise its Electric Distribution and Gas Rates Accordingly, and for Related Substantive and Procedural Relief.

Application 05-05-012
(Filed May 9, 2005)

**OPINION GRANTING INTERVENOR COMPENSATION TO
AGLET CONSUMER ALLIANCE AND THE UTILITY REFORM NETWORK
FOR SUBSTANTIAL CONTRIBUTIONS TO DECISION 05-12-043**

I. Summary

We award Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) and The Utility Reform Network (TURN), or Aglet-TURN, jointly \$123,276 for their substantial contributions to Decision (D.) 05-12-043. The award is approximately \$6,300 less than requested.

II. Background

The subject costs of capital applications were filed by Pacific Gas and Electric Company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE) and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E). PG&E requested authority to increase its 11.22% Return on Equity (ROE) to 11.50% for test year 2006. SCE requested authority to increase its 11.40% ROE to 11.80% for test year 2006. SDG&E requested authority to increase its 10.38% ROE to 12.00% and to increase its 49.00% common equity ratio to 51.00% for test year 2006.

By D.05-12-043, a test year 2006 ROE of 11.35% was adopted for PG&E, 11.60% for SCE, and 10.70% for SDG&E. SDG&E's request to increase its common equity ratio was denied.

PG&E, SCE, SDG&E, the Federal Executive Agencies (FEA), and the Division of Ratepayer Advocates (DRA), formerly the Office of Ratepayer Advocates, actively participated in this proceeding. Intervenors Aglet, TURN and The Utility Consumers' Action Network (UCAN) actively participated in this proceeding jointly. Aglet-TURN jointly request compensation here. SCE filed a response to the Aglet-TURN request, as discussed herein.

This proceeding remains open to address a petition for modification of D.05-12-043 filed by SDG&E.

III. Requirements for Award of Compensation

The intervenor compensation program, enacted in Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812,¹ requires California jurisdictional utilities to pay the reasonable costs of an intervenor's participation if the intervenor makes a substantial contribution to the Commission's proceedings. The statute provides that the utility may adjust its rates to collect the amount awarded from its ratepayers.

All of the following procedures and criteria must be satisfied for an intervenor to obtain a compensation award:

1. The intervenor must satisfy certain procedural requirements including the filing of a sufficient notice of intent (NOI) to claim compensation within 30 days of the prehearing conference (PHC). (§ 1804(a).)
2. The intervenor must be a customer or a participant representing consumers, customers, or subscribers of a utility subject to our jurisdiction. (§ 1802(b).)
3. The intervenor should file and serve a request for a compensation award within 60 days of our final order or decision in a hearing or proceeding. (§ 1804(c).)
4. The intervenor must demonstrate "significant financial hardship." (§§ 1802(g), 1804(b)(1).)
5. The intervenor's presentation must have made a "substantial contribution" to the proceeding, through the adoption, in whole or in part, of the intervenor's contention or recommendations by a Commission order or decision. (§§ 1802(h), 1803(a).)

¹ All references to the Public Utilities Code.

6. The claimed fees and costs are comparable to the market rates paid to experts and advocates having comparable training and experience and offering similar services. (§ 1806.)

IV. Procedural Requirements

The first four of the above requirements are procedural and we address them below. The PHC in this matter was held on June 16, 2005. Aglet-TURN filed their joint NOI timely on July 13, 2005. In their joint NOI, Aglet-TURN asserted financial hardship. On July 28, 2005, the assigned Administrative Law Judge (ALJ) ruled that Aglet-TURN are customers, pursuant to § 1802(b)(1)(C), and satisfied the significant financial hardship condition through a rebuttable presumption of eligibility, pursuant to § 1804(b)(1).

Aglet-TURN filed their joint request for compensation on February 14, 2006, within the required 60 days of D.05-12-043 being issued.

We affirm the ALJ's ruling and find that Aglet-TURN have satisfied all the procedural requirements necessary to make their joint request for compensation.

V. Substantial Contribution to Resolution of Issues

In evaluating whether a customer made a substantial contribution to a proceeding, we look at several things. First, did the ALJ or Commission adopt one or more of the factual or legal contentions, or specific policy or procedural recommendations put forward by the customer? (*See* § 1802(h).) Second, if the customer's contentions or recommendations paralleled those of another party, did the customer's participation materially supplement, complement, or contribute to the presentation of the other party or to the development of a fuller record that assisted the Commission in making its decision? (*See* §§ 1802(h) and 1802.5.) As described in § 1802(h), the assessment of whether the customer made a substantial contribution requires the exercise of judgment.

In assessing whether the customer meets this standard, the Commission typically reviews the record, composed in part of pleadings of the customer and, in litigated matters, the hearing transcripts, and compares it to the findings, conclusions, and orders in the decision to which the customer asserts it contributed. It is then a matter of judgment as to whether the customer's presentation substantially assisted the Commission.²

Should the Commission not adopt any of the customer's recommendations, compensation may be awarded if, in the judgment of the Commission, the customer's participation substantially contributed to the decision or order. For example, if a customer provided a unique perspective that enriched the Commission's deliberations and the record, the Commission could find that the customer made a substantial contribution.³ With this guidance in mind, we turn to the claimed contributions Aglet-TURN made to this proceeding.

Although the Commission did not adopt the specific ROE recommendations of Aglet-TURN for the utilities, their financial model results and ROE recommendations were used to arrive at a broad ROE range for PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E. *See Findings of Fact 22, Conclusions of Law 9, 11, and 13.*

Using that broad ROE range, we adopted a test year 2006 ROE of 11.35% for PG&E, 11.60% for SCE, and 10.70% for SDG&E. These adopted ROEs were 15 basis points lower than PG&E's 11.60% request and 13 basis points higher

² See D.98-04-059, 79 CPUC2d, 628 at 653.

³ See D.03-12-019, discussing D.89-03-063 (31 CPUC2d 402) (awarding San Luis Obispo Mothers for Peace and Rochelle Becker compensation in the Diablo Canyon Rate Case because their arguments, although ultimately unsuccessful, forced the utility to thoroughly document the safety issues involved).

than Aglet-TURN's 11.22% recommendation, 20 basis points lower than SCE's 11.80% request and 120 basis points higher than Aglet-TURN's 10.40% recommendation, and 130 basis points lower than SDG&E's 12.00% request and 50 basis points higher than Aglet-TURN's 10.20% recommendation. *See Conclusions of Law 10, 12, and 14 and Ordering Paragraphs 1, 2, and 3.*

Aglet-TURN also claimed a substantial contribution relating to the Commission's rejection of SDG&E's request for a higher equity ratio to mitigate debt equivalence which was opposed by Aglet-TURN through testimony, examination of witnesses and briefs. *See Findings of Fact 9 and 11, and Conclusions of Law 3 and 4.*

Aglet-TURN acknowledged that the FEA and DRA also recommended ROEs lower than those requested by the utilities. However, we find that Aglet-TURN achieved efficiencies through their joint participation in this proceeding, which included testimony, examination of witnesses and filing of briefs, and that Aglet-TURN's showing complemented the showings of DRA and FEA. (*See* § 1802.5.) Overall, we find that Aglet-TURN jointly made a substantial contribution to D.05-12-043.

VI. Reasonableness of Requested Compensation

Aglet-TURN request \$129,583⁴ for their joint participation in this proceeding. To assist us in determining the reasonableness of the requested compensation, D.98-04-059 directed customers to demonstrate productivity by assigning a reasonable dollar value to the benefits of their participation to

⁴ This amount includes \$719 for recovery of Aglet-TURN's cost to respond to SCE's opposition to the compensation request. Aglet-TURN also spent \$31,303 more than the \$98,280 Aglet-TURN budgeted in their joint NOI due primarily to Weil spending approximately 100 hours and Reid 60 hours more than budgeted in the NOI.

ratepayers. The costs of a customer's participation should bear a reasonable relationship to the benefits realized through their participation. The issues we consider to determine reasonableness are discussed below.

A. Productivity

Although the Commission adopted ROEs for PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E that were higher than those recommended by Aglet-TURN, the adopted ROEs were lower than those requested by the utilities. The Commission also rejected SDG&E's debt equivalence argument and request to increase its equity ratio to 51% from 49%, which Aglet-TURN opposed.

Aglet-TURN quantified the most observable dollar benefit of their joint participation in terms of the adopted ROEs being lower than those requested by the utilities. PG&E's ratepayers saved approximately \$16.5 million due to the adoption of an 11.35% ROE over PG&E's requested 11.50%. SCE's ratepayers saved approximately \$14.7 million due to the adoption of an 11.60% ROE over SCE's requested 11.80%. SDG&E's ratepayers saved approximately \$29.8 million due to the adoption of a 10.70% ROE and 49% equity ratio over SDG&E's requested 12.00% ROE and a 51% equity ratio.

The annual ratepayer revenue requirement benefit identified by Aglet-TURN substantiates that the costs of their joint participation are reasonable in relationship to the benefits ratepayers will realize through that participation.

B. Hours and Costs Related to and Necessary for Substantial Contribution

The components of this request must constitute reasonable fees and costs of the customer's preparation for and participation in a proceeding that resulted in a substantial contribution. Thus, only those fees and costs associated with the customer's work that the Commission concludes made a substantial contribution are reasonable and eligible for compensation.

Aglet-TURN documented their claimed hours⁵ by presenting a daily breakdown of the hours, major activity, and description of work their attorneys and advocates devoted to the proceeding. The following tabulation summarizes the direct time Aglet-TURN spent by major issues and professionals.⁶

	General ⁷	Qualitative	Quantitative ⁸	Debt Equivalent	Other Issues ⁹	Total Direct
Weil	21.3	78.6	113.1	6.8	26.3	246.1
Finkelstein	1.5					1.5
Goodson	6.5	35.6	51.3	3.1	12.0	108.5
Hawiger		0.4	0.6	0.1	0.2	1.3
Czahar			72.0			72.0
Reid				116.3		116.3
Total	29.3	114.6	237.0	126.3	38.5	545.7

Aglet-TURN believe that the total number of their claimed direct hours is reasonable given the scope of this proceeding. Our prior discussion of Aglet-TURN's substantial contribution and productivity substantiate that Aglet-TURN's hours are reasonable. We make no adjustment to the requested hours of Weil, Finkelstein, Goodson, Czahar, and Reid.

⁵ All time is rounded to a tenth of an hour.

⁶ Individual hours may not equal total hours due to rounding.

⁷ General work includes initial review and discovery activities.

⁸ Quantitative includes analysis of interest rate changes and work on financial models, ROE recommendations, and credit ratios.

⁹ Other issues include capital structure and credit ratio targets.

Aglet-TURN stated that Hawiger contributed a few hours of management-related decision and advice. A review of the supporting documentation shows that Hawiger spent 1.3 hours on July 27, 2005 reading an ALJ Ruling and sending an internal email. However, the only ALJ ruling issued prior to that date was a verbal ruling issued at the June 16, 2005 PHC, more than a month prior to that date. Absent justification for the time Hawiger spent on this proceeding, we disallow all of his time.

The following tabulation summarizes the indirect time Aglet-Turn spent traveling to and from hearings, preparing and responding to opposition to their joint NOI and joint compensation request.

	Travel	NOI	Compensation Request	Total
Weil	22.0	2.1	15.8	39.9
Goodson		0.5	3.0	3.5
Finkelstein	-	-	0.5	0.5
Reid	4.7	-	2.0	6.7
Total	26.7	2.6	21.3	50.6

The 26.7 hours of travel time and 2.6 hours spent in preparing a joint NOI is reasonable and allowable. The 21.3 hours of time spent preparing a joint compensation request is also reasonable and allowable.

C. Market Rate Standard

Finally, in determining compensation, we take into consideration the market rates for similar services from comparably qualified persons. Aglet-TURN seek an hourly rate of \$250 for work performed by Weil in 2005 and 2006, and half that rate for his travel time and work on the NOI in 2005 and

preparation of the compensation request in 2006; \$395 for Finkelstein in 2005; \$190 for Goodson in 2005 and 2006 and half that rate for compensation-related work in 2005 and 2006; \$270 for Hawiger in 2005; \$220 for Czahar in 2005; \$200 for Reid in 2005 and half that rate for travel time in 2005 and compensation-related work in 2006.

The Commission has previously approved these rates for work performed by Weil, Finkelstein, Goodson, and Czahar.¹⁰ We find these rates reasonable and adopt them here. In light of our disallowance of Hawiger's hours, the corresponding rate request is moot.

Aglet-TURN seek a \$200 hourly rate for work performed by Reid in 2005. This is the first request for approval of an hourly rate for Reid. In support of the requested rate, Aglet-TURN submit that Reid holds a Business Administration (BA) degree in economics and an Master of Science (MS) degree in applied economics and finance. The subject of Reid's master's thesis was the capital asset pricing model, a standard financial model regularly used in the Commission's ROE proceedings. Reid was employed at the Commission for more than seven years and appeared as an expert witness for DRA on policy and technical issues relating to utility finance, cost of capital, PG&E's bankruptcy and electric procurement.

The burden of proof in a compensation award is with the party seeking an award. For persons like Reid, for whom no rates have been established previously, D.05-11-031 instructs us to set rates within an adopted \$110 to

¹⁰ See D.05-03-016, *mimeo.*, p. 11 for Weil, Finkelstein, and Czahar; D.04-12-033, *mimeo.*, p. 10 for Goodson; and D.05-06-031, *mimeo.*, p. 41 for Hawiger.

\$360 hourly range, the exact rate of which is to be determined from training and experience of an individual as compared to peers.

Hence, we must compare Reid's qualifications to the qualifications of other experts whose rates have been established. Aglet-TURN stated that the requested \$200 hourly rate for Reid matches the hourly rate that the Commission approved for Weil after he retired from the Commission in 1997 and lower than the hourly rate the Commission approved for Czahar's work in 2002. However, they neither asserted that Weil and Czahar are considered to be peers to Reid nor provided any comparison of Reid's training and experience to that of Weil or Czahar. Absent a peer assertion and comparison of training and experience, the hourly rates applicable to Weil and Czahar are irrelevant in determining an appropriate hourly rate for Reid.

As Reid's peers, Aglet-TURN identified David Purkey, Bill Trush, Sandra McDonald, Michael McDonald, John Gamboa and Michael Phillips, all of whom had hourly rates established in D.04-08-025 that were either consistent with or higher than the hourly rate being requested for Reid. Again, other than stating that Reid's requested hourly rate is consistent with rates approved for these other expert witnesses, and that Reid has more experience testifying before the Commission than any of these experts, Aglet-TURN did not provide any comparison of Reid's training or experience to these identified persons.

Nevertheless, we will scrutinize the underlying record in D.04-08-025 for the asserted peer group and other compensation decisions to assess the reasonableness of an initial \$200 hourly rate for Reid. The result of this scrutiny is set forth in Appendix A.

In the future, Aglet-Turn and other intervenors seeking approval of an hourly rate for a representative for whom no rates have been established

previously should provide as part of their request for an award a comparison between that representative's qualifications and experience to the qualifications and experience of other representatives deemed comparable.

Similar to Reid's requested hourly rate and training, Purkey and Trush were last awarded a \$200 hourly rate and earned BA and MS degrees. However, unlike Reid, Purkey and Trush also earned PhDs, and their experience as scientist appears to exceed the experience of Reid. The McDonalds, Gamboa and Phillips also have more extensive experience than Reid. Gamboa and Phillips also have more extensive experience testifying before this Commission.¹¹ Aglet-TURN have not demonstrated that the training and experience of Reid is comparable to that of Purkey, Trush, the McDonalds, Gamboa, or Phillips. Hence, their authorized hourly rates should not be used as a benchmark to establish an hourly rate for Reid.

We next look to recent compensation awards to find an intervenor awarded an hourly rate who has similar training and experience to that of Reid. In D.06-04-022, expert John Galloway was awarded a \$120 hourly rate for his work in 2005. Galloway and Reid earned BA and MBA degrees and previously worked for the Commission. Galloway had five years' experience with the Commission compared to Reid's seven years. Galloway had two years prior experience with a regulated telecommunications carrier while Reid had five years prior experience consulting on computer hardware and software applications. Information was not provided on what extent Galloway has testified before this Commission.

¹¹ See, for example, D.97-03-067, D.99-04-023, D.01-09-011, D.01-09-011, D.03-03-022, D.03-04-050, D.03-10-062, D.03-11-021, and D.04-08-025.

The training and experience of Galloway is reasonably comparable to that of Reid. Given Reid's additional time at the Commission and know testifying experience, the hourly rate for Reid should be set at \$150.

D. Direct Expenses

Aglet-TURN also seek recovery of their office costs incurred as a result of their participation in this proceeding. These costs totaling \$1,435 consist of reproduction (copy) cost, postage, and travel costs.¹² These costs represent approximately 1.1% of the total compensation request and only \$85 more than the \$1,350 budgeted in their joint NOI. Aglet-TURN adequately substantiated their office costs and should be compensated for the full \$1,435.

VII. SCE Response

SCE opposed the Aglet-TURN compensation request, asserting that it is excessive in regard to (1) the compensation claimed for work on debt equivalence, and (2) the hourly rate requested for Reid. (We have disposed of the latter issue above.) SCE also asserted that any authorized compensation should be reduced by one-third. As we discuss below, SCE's response is unpersuasive.

A. Discussion

SCE compared Aglet-TURN's compensation request of approximately \$129,000 in this proceeding to their \$74,000 request in last year's cost-of-capital proceeding. If anything, according to SCE, this year's cost-of-capital proceeding involved fewer issues, so the increase in Aglet-TURN's costs is anomalous.

¹² This category is \$10 higher than the \$1,412 requested amount to correct an addition error in the office expenses of Czahar. Although Aglet-TURN requested \$20 in office expenses incurred by Czahar his actual expenses totaled \$30 consisting of \$5 facsimile, \$10 telephone and \$15 copying costs.

Section 1803 provides for an award of reasonable advocates fees for a substantial contribution to the adoption, in whole or in part, of a Commission decision. We concur that the requested award is higher than that requested in last year's cost-of-capital proceeding. However, the dollar request is based on Aglet-TURN's actual time and costs incurred to participate in this proceeding. We have already reviewed Aglet-TURN's documented hours and costs devoted to this proceeding and concluding that, except for time spent by Hawiger and the requested hourly rate for Reid, the documented hours and costs are reasonable. Hence, an adjustment to the award based on Aglet-TURN's prior year's cost of capital compensation request is neither appropriate nor reasonable as a benchmark for this or future cost-of-capital proceedings.

SCE recommended a reduction of any compensation award by one-third on the basis that only two of the three entities (Aglet and TURN) being represented by Aglet-TURN requested and received authority to claim compensation. UCAN, also represented by Aglet-TURN, did not seek eligibility to claim compensation in this proceeding. We reject this proposal on the basis that there is no identifiable cost associated with UCAN in the award request. The compensation that Aglet-TURN seek reimbursement for would have been precisely the same had Aglet and TURN participated in this proceeding without UCAN.

VIII. Award

Aglet-TURN substantially assisted the Commission in this proceeding. Consistent with § 1802(h), Aglet-TURN are jointly entitled to compensation that totals \$ 123,276, as set forth in the table below.

ITEM	YEAR	HOURS	RATE	TOTAL AMOUNT
Advocate Weil	2005-06	246.1	\$250	\$ 61,525
	2005-06	39.9	125	4,988
Attorney Finkelstein	2005	1.5	395	593
	2006	.5	198	99
Attorney Goodson	2005-06	108.5	190	20,615
	2005-06	3.5	95	333
Analyst Czahar	2005	72.0	220	15,840
Consultant Reid	2005-06	116.3	150	17,445
	2005-06	6.7	75	503
Office Costs:				
Copies & Facsimile				558
Lexis Research				181
Postage				162
Telephone				13
Mileage, Tolls & Parking				521
TOTAL				\$123,276

Consistent with previous Commission decisions, we will order that interest be paid on the award amount (at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15) commencing on April 30, 2006, the 75th day after Aglet-TURN filed their joint compensation request and continuing until full payment of the award is made.

We remind Aglet-TURN that Commission staff may audit their records related to this award, and that intervenors must make and retain adequate accounting and other documentation to support all claims for intervenor compensation. Aglet-TURN's records should identify specific issues for which they requested compensation, the actual time spent by each employee, the applicable hourly rate, fees paid to consultants, and any other costs for which compensation was claimed.

IX. Waiver of Comment Period

This is an intervenor compensation matter. Accordingly, as provided by Rule 77.7(f)(6) of our Rules of Practice and Procedure, we waive the otherwise applicable 30-day comment period for this decision.

X. Assignment of Proceeding

Michael R. Peevey is the Assigned Commissioner and Michael J. Galvin is the assigned ALJ in this proceeding.

Findings of Fact

1. Aglet-TURN have satisfied all of the procedural requirements necessary to claim compensation in this proceeding.
2. Aglet-TURN made substantial contributions to D.05-12-043, as described herein.

3. Aglet-TURN requested hourly rates for its representatives, as adjusted herein, that are reasonable when compared to the market rates for persons with similar training and experience.

4. Aglet-TURN requested related expenses that are reasonable and commensurate with the work performed.

5. The total of these reasonable fees and costs is \$123,276.

6. The attachment to this opinion summarizes today's award.

Conclusions of Law

1. Aglet-TURN fulfilled the requirements of Pub. Util. Code §§ 1801-1812, which govern awards of intervenor compensation, and are entitled to intervenor compensation for their claimed fees and expenses incurred in making substantial contribution to D.04-12-047.

2. Aglet-TURN should be awarded \$123,276 for contributions to D.05-12-043.

3. Per Rule 77.7(f)(6), the comment period for this compensation decision may be waived.

4. So that Aglet-TURN's award may be paid promptly, today's order should be made effective immediately.

O R D E R

IT IS ORDERED that:

1. Aglet Consumer Alliance (Aglet) and The Utility Reform Network (TURN) are jointly awarded \$ 123,276 as compensation for their joint substantial contributions to Decision 05-12-043.

2. Within 30 days of the effective date of this decision, Pacific Gas and Electric company (PG&E), Southern California Edison Company (SCE), and San Diego Gas & Electric Company (SDG&E) shall pay Aglet-TURN \$ 123,276, in

proportion to their respective 2005 jurisdictional electric and gas revenues within 30 days of the effective date of this order. PG&E, SCE and SDG&E shall pay their full shares of the award to Aglet, and Aglet shall disburse the portions between Aglet and TURN as appropriate. PG&E, SCE, and SDG&E shall also pay interest on the award at the rate earned on prime, three-month commercial paper, as reported in Federal Reserve Statistical Release H.15 commencing April 30, 2006 and continuing until full payment is made.

3. The comment period for today's decision is waived.

This order is effective today.

Dated June 29, 2006, at San Francisco, California.

MICHAEL R. PEEVEY
President
GEOFFREY F. BROWN
DIAN M. GRUENEICH
JOHN A. BOHN
RACHELLE B. CHONG
Commissioners

APPENDIX A
PEER TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE COMPARISON

NAME/ Authorized Rate	Training	Experience
Reid Request \$200/2006	BA-Economics MS- Applied Economics & Finance	Finance Consultant. Seven years as a Commission employee working on cost-of-capital, electric procurement, risk management and credit ratings. Testified before the Commission and made workshop presentations, developed econometric models, & provided internal financial & economic analysis. Prior five years consulted on hardware and software, computer training, technical documentation, data-conversion and computer programming.
Purkey \$200/2002	BA-Geology, MS- Engineering PHD-Hydrology	Scientist, Senior Hydrologist - model water systems & groundwater management.
Trush \$200/2002	BS-Zoology MS-Zoology PHD- Wildland Resource Science	Scientist, Humboldt State University Adjunct Professor, cofounder & president of a consulting firm specializing in evaluating impacts of dams and planning and implementing river restoration plans.
McDonald, Sandra \$250/2003	BS- Engineering MBA	Finance Consultant. 15 years utility financing including nine years as investment banker, California's Independent System Operator Corporation and Power Exchange financial advisor, Vice President of Enron Capital and trade, and fixed income & commodity markets financial advisor.

APPENDIX A
PEER TRAINING AND EXPERIENCE COMPARISON

NAME/ Authorized Rate	Training	Experience
McDonald, Michael \$250/2003	Not specifically identified in D.04-08-025.	Involved in electric industry since the mid-1970. Served 9 years in a public power community as an assistant city manager and city manager, Northern California Power Agency general manager, Transmission Agency of Northern California Chairman, and led Enron North America's public power origination group.
Gamboa \$330/2003	Not specifically identified in D.04-08-025.	Policy Witness. Over 11 years experience with a major telephone company, served on the Commission's Universal Lifeline Telephone Service advisory board, various corporate partnership boards, and as Greenlining Executive Director. Testified on numerous Commission proceedings.
Phillips \$310/2003	BA-Economics	Policy Consultant. Former Bank Vice President, Glide Memorial Methodist Church business manager, Point Foundation president, author of numerous finance, economics, business development, and marketing books, and participated in developing the original MasterCard concept.
Galloway \$120/2005 (D.06-04-022)	BA-Engineering Masters-Energy & Resources	Senior Energy Analyst. Seven years experience. Five years experience as a Commission employee working on renewable energy & distribution policy and two years with a regulated telecommunications company.

(END OF APPENDIX A)

ATTACHMENT

Compensation Decision:	D0606049
Contribution Decision(s):	D0512043
Proceeding(s):	A0505006, A0505011, A0505012
Author:	ALJ Galvin
Payer(s):	Pacific Gas and Electric Co., Southern California Edison Company, and San Diego Gas & Electric Company

Intervenor Information

Intervenor	Claim Date	Amount Requested	Amount Awarded	Multiplier ?	Reason Change/Disallowance
Aglet Consumer Alliance and The Utility Reform Network (Aglet-TURN)	2/14/2006	\$129,583	\$123,276	No	Non-substantiated hourly rate for Reid and non-substantiated time spent by Hawiger

Advocate Information

First Name	Last Name	Type	Intervenor	Hourly Fee Requested	Year Hourly Fee Requested	Hourly Fee Adopted
James	Weil	Advocate	Aglet	\$280	2005/2006	\$280
Bob	Finkelstein	Attorney	TURN	\$425	2005/2006	\$425
Hayley	Goodson	Attorney	TURN	\$220	2005/2006	\$220
Marcel	Hawiger	Attorney	TURN	\$270	2005	\$270
Ray	Czahar	Analysis	Aglet	\$240	2005/2006	\$240
Jan	Reid	Analysis	Aglet	\$200	2005/2006	\$150

(END OF ATTACHMENT)